

**Remarks**

Claims 1-33 are under consideration.

The indication that claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form is noted with appreciation. To that end, claims 3 and 8 have been rewritten in independent form and are deemed to be allowable. Claim 4 depends on allowable claim 3 and claim 9 depends on allowable claim 8.

In addition, claim 5 is amended so as to be dependent on allowable claim 3 and should be allowable as well.

Similarly, claims 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26 and 27 are amended so as to be dependent on allowable claim 8 and should also be allowable.

Claim 28 is amended so as to incorporate therein the amounts of impregnation specified in allowable claim 3 and should be allowable as amended.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-13, 15, and 18-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshikawa et al. is not warranted and is hereby traversed. Yoshikawa et al. does not expressly teach the presence of both a cationic emulsifier and a non-ionic emulsifier. Moreover, Yoshikawa et al. provides no motivation to one of ordinary skill to utilize such a combination of emulsifiers.

In addition, Yoshikawa et al. is effectively antedated as a reference by the Declaration Under Rule 131 by co-inventor Michael A. Schultz submitted concurrently herewith. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is requested.

The rejection of claims 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshikawa et al. in view of Ishii et al. is traversed as well.

Yoshikawa et al. has been effectively antedated as a reference by the aforementioned Declaration Under Rule 131. Ishii et al. is not combinable with Yoshikawa et al. in any event because the formulations taught by Ishii et al. are entirely different, to wit, water dispersions of polytetrafluoroethylene and perfluoropolyether.

Besides, claims 14 and 16 have been amended to depend on allowable claim 8, and claim 17 depends on claim 16.

The rejection of claim 28 and claims 30-33 as unpatentable over Yoshikawa et al. in view of Bonk is likewise traversed. As recognized by the Examiner, Yoshikawa et al.

fail to teach a combination of cationic and non-ionic emulsifiers. Bonk does not remedy this shortcoming of Yoshikawa et al. as a reference against these claims. Yoshikawa et al. also has been antedated as a reference by the aforementioned Declaration Under Rule 131.

Furthermore, claim 28, the independent claim, has been amended to incorporate therein the amounts of impregnation specified in allowable claim 8, thus claim 28 and the claims dependent thereon, i.e., claims 30-33 and also claim 29, are amply distinguished over the applied references.

The further rejection of claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshikawa et al. in view of Laipply is also traversed. Yoshikawa et al. fails as a reference against claims 28 and 29 for the same reasons as stated above. Claim 28 and thus dependent claim 29 are distinguished over Yoshikawa et al. by the present amendment to claim 28. Moreover, Yoshikawa et al. has been antedated by the aforementioned Declaration Under Rule 131.

The references cited but not applied against the claims have been reviewed with interest. None of these references, whether considered alone or in combination, are deemed to vitiate the patentability of the present claims.

The present amendments to the claims, the accompanying discussion, and the concurrently submitted Declaration Under Rule 131 are deemed to dispose of all issues in this case and to place this application in condition for allowance. Early passing of this application to issue is solicited.

Our check in the amount of \$168.00 to cover the fee for two additional independent claims accompanies this Amendment and Response. Kindly charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to our USPTO Deposit Account No. 15-0508.

Respectfully submitted,

July 17, 2003

By   
Talivaldis Cepuntis (Reg. No. 20,818)

OLSON & HIERL, LTD.  
20 North Wacker Drive  
36th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 580-1180